

Application Serial No. 09/994,521
Attorney's Docket No.: 07326-002002

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9, 17 and 21 stand rejected over Auer et al in view of Tymes. This contention, however, is respectfully traversed, and for reasons set forth herein, it is respectfully suggested that the rejection does not meet the patent office's burden of providing a prima facie showing of unpatentability.

Basically, Auer et al is provided for teaching of a separated keyboard and display, and Tymes is provided for teaching of operating in bursts with delays between the bursts. However, Tymes is a very different kind of system. Tymes operates in bursts because each of the remote terminals 15 only gets information at certain separated times. There is no teaching or suggestion and Tymes of a system that provides the information in bursts with delays between the bursts, but yet provides a continuously displayed full-screen display, using that output signal received in bursts. Tymes simply teaches that when data is only available at times, you can receive and/or transmit it in bursts, and turns off between the bursts.

Auer et al teaches a computer interface device. There is no teaching or suggestion of how this kind of system could operate based on bursts of data. Therefore, the hypothetical combination of Auer et al and Tymes would teach a computer

Application Serial No. 09/994,521
Attorney's Docket No.: 07326-002002

device as shown in Auer et al, along with the teaching of Tymes that when the data was available in bursts, that it could be transmitted in bursts and turned off in between the bursts. Nowhere, however, is there any teaching or suggestion that a continuously-displayed full-screen display is obtained using the display output signal received in bursts, as required by claim 1. Even if the hypothetical combination of Auer et al in view of Tymes were made, this combination would still not be present or suggested.

Therefore, claim 1 should be allowable along with the claims that depend therefrom.

There is no teaching or suggestion in either references or the combination thereof, of the directional coupler of claim 9. The rejection takes "official notice" of directional couplers. However, this official notice is respectfully traversed. Directional couplers have been used in various systems, but not in a wireless transceiver of the type claimed. To the extent that the rejection attempts to establish that directional couplers been well-known in the art, with all due respect, the patent office is requested, as set forth in the MPEP, to cite a reference in support of the fact that the directional couplers are well-known in this field.

Application Serial No. 09/994,521
Attorney's Docket No.: 07326-002002

Claim 17 defines additional subject matter which is in no way taught or suggested by the art. Claim 17 defines not only the existing full screen display, but also that the burst provides new graphics information "for changed portions of the existing full screen display". In rejecting claim 17, the rejection simply states that Tymes teaches a fullscreen display, and draws our attention to column 6, lines 45-69. Auer et al column 6, lines 45-69 refers to the claims. However, nowhere is there any teaching or suggestion in the hypothetical combination of references of the claimed subject matter that the burst provides new graphics information for changed portions of the existing fullscreen display. Claim 17 should therefore be allowable for these reasons.

Claim 21 defines the output signal being produced in bursts, and should be allowable for reasons discussed above. Claim 21 further defines that the information wirelessly interacts with the application program that is executable on the basic system. All of this is completely patentable over the cited prior art, which should hence be allowable.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, therefore, all of the claims should be in condition for allowance. A formal notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Application Serial No. 09/994,521
Attorney's Docket No.: 07326-002002

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.


In view of the above amendments and remarks, therefore, all of the claims should be in condition for allowance. A formal notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Application Serial No. 09/994,521
Attorney's Docket No.: 07326-002002

Applicant asks that all claims be allowed. Please apply
/ other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 12, 2004


Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030

Fish & Richardson P.C.
PTO Customer Number: 20985
4350 La Jolla Village Drive, Suite 500
San Diego, CA 92122
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099
10446268.doc